



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/586,012	07/14/2006	Sang-Rak Lee	1630.016	9324
29338	7590	12/08/2008	EXAMINER	
PARK LAW FIRM 3255 WILSHIRE BLVD SUITE 1110 LOS ANGELES, CA 90010			TEJANO, DWIGHT ALEX C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			4112	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/586,012

Applicant(s)

LEE, SANG-RAK

Examiner

Dwight Alex C. Tejano

Art Unit

4112

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1 June 2007.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-893)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 14 July 2006
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. The claims are objected to because they include reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses.

Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shin (KR 2004032208) in view of Kligman (US 2001/0037509) and further in view of Liu, et al. ("Liu," EP 0697689.)**

4. Regarding **claim 1**, Shin teaches an internet-enabled DVD monitor. Of the limitations of claim 1, Shin discloses:

- a) an LCD monitor (Fig. 2) [27]
- b) a memory ("SDRAM," 301) [17]
- c) a single main body (Fig. 2) [31]
- d) an HDD [18]
- e) an internet interface ("internet connection port", 305) [21]

5. Furthermore, the Examiner maintains that an LCD panel, a backlight, and an LCD driver are inherent objects of the LCD monitors, as they must exist in order for LCD monitors to function. An LCD panel is necessary to contain the liquid crystal material and have a screen upon which to show an image. Without a backlight, the image shown on the screen would not be seen, and, without an LCD driver, the image on the LCD screen would not be properly displayed. As such, these elements are considered inherently disclosed by Shin.

6. Additionally, the Examiner maintains that, although "microcomputer" is never explicitly stated, Shin has disclosed a controller (300) that is analogous to a microcomputer. Shin explicitly states that the controller (300) is set in the device and controls the device as a whole [17.] The controller, within the single main body of the device, manipulates graphic acceleration, memory control, data signal input/output, and graphic signal processing. In other words, the controller, set within the single main

body, manages and controls the signals sent through the system. As such, this controller reads upon the claimed "microcomputer set in the device to program and manage control signals including processing sequences." Therefore, "microcomputer" is considered disclosed by Shin.

7. Moreover, the Examiner also maintains that, although the "image processor" is never explicitly stated, the component is also analogously disclosed by Shin. Shin discloses that the controller (300) contains the graphics acceleration function, such that any "inputted graphic signal is processed [in] the acceleration" and such that any "video signal ... is inputted [and] processed" for proper display. These functions performed by the controller are analogous to an "image processor." Therefore, "image processor" is considered disclosed by Shin.

8. In a similar vein, the Examiner also maintains that, although "image pre-processor" is never explicitly stated, the component is analogously disclosed by Shin, as well. In the Applicant's own disclosure, the image pre-processor is used to convert analog video signals to digital signals and to input those digital signals to the image processor (p. 2, ln. 18-20.) Considered as such, this pre-processor is analogous to the MPEG decoder (309) and the video decoder (310) disclosed by Shin. Shin states that the YUV format signals (analog) are decoded into digital 8-bit signals that are transmitted to the controller, which, as stated above, is analogous to the image processor [26.] As this reads upon the "conver[sion] into digital signals through an

image pre-processor and input to the image processor,” the “image pre-processor” is considered disclosed by Shin.

9. Regarding the single main body (sec. 4, part c, above), Fig. 2 shows the single body of the convergence (integrated) device, and Shin describes the system as “implemented in terms of one system” [31.] As such, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the image processor, memory, and HDD “are set within the single main body of the system.”

10. As for the internet interface (sec. 4, part e, above), Shin describes the interface as a “means to connect to the internet” [21.] While Shin does not state which protocol is used in connection to the internet, different connection protocols are only software variations of the method to connect to the internet — they have little consequence over the hardware interface itself. Furthermore, TCP/IP is a protocol suite that has been a popular method of networking since the early 1980s and has become the standard in internet connection since the early 1990s. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement an internet connection through TCP/IP.

Furthermore, Fig. 3 shows the internet interface as being connected to the controller (300), which, as stated above, is analogous to the image processor. As such, “an internet interface connected to the image processor” is also considered disclosed.

11. However, despite all of this, Shin does not disclose the use of a wired/wireless camera. Based on art taught by Kligman, the Examiner maintains that the use of such elements was well known.
12. In a similar field of endeavor regarding surveillance systems, Kligman discloses a hybrid wired/wireless video surveillance system. In this disclosure, Kligman teaches:
- a) a wired camera (2) [0021]
 - b) a wireless camera (4) [0022]
 - c) a wireless transceiver ("wireless receiver," 20) [0022]

Furthermore, Kligman teaches that his surveillance system connects to both a single monitor for local surveillance and to a networked computer in order to facilitate remote surveillance [0032.]

13. Because Shin teaches the benefit of combining internet connectivity with a monitor, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the Shin's internet DVD monitor with Kligman's hybrid surveillance system. The combination of the two (i.e., the single-monitor surveillance system combined with the embedded internet connectivity) would thereby streamline and cost-reduce the Kligman system as a whole by eliminating the need for separate system components.
14. The system created by the combination of Kligman and Shin does not disclose the use of an IR remote or IR receiver to control the television component of the device.

However, the Examiner maintains that the addition of an infrared remote is well known in the art, as taught by Liu.

15. Liu discloses an integrated computer and television, wherein the functions of the computer and the functions of the television are combined in one single main body form factor. Liu discloses that a remote control (25) is used to control those functions (p. 3, col. 3, ln. 2 – 13.) Furthermore, Fig. 3 discloses a microcontroller (43) to receive the IR signal.

16. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the remote control of Liu's integrated TV with the system of Kligman and Shin, as the IR remote would allow for an easier mode of manual control over the numerous functions of the system.

17. Regarding **claim 2**, all of the limitations of claim 1 are met via the system created by Shin, Kligman, and Liu, as described above. Additionally, Shin discloses the use of flash memory or memory stick (308) [24]. This is analogous to a separable hard disk drive, as both are forms of removable storage media. Both can be easily added and removed, and both are easily upgradeable. Therefore, the separable HDD is considered disclosed by Shin.

Citation of Pertinent Art

18. The prior art made of record is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure, but is not relied upon as a reference for the preceding sections:

- Kim (KR 10-1997-0066842) discloses an integrated television/computer system employing a plasma display.
- Pan (US 2005/0047107) discloses an all-in-one computer/dual monitor LCD with printer, scanner, and webcam.
- Hesselink (US 2003/0051006) discloses a surveillance system connected to a networked computer over the TCP/IP network protocol that can be controlled remotely.
- Arya (WO 0118658) discloses a video system employing a computer integrated system that is connected to the internet.

Conclusion

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dwight Alex C. Tejano whose telephone number is (571) 270-7200. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:30-6:00 with alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jefferey F. Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7519. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Dwight Alex C Tezano
Examiner
Art Unit 4112

/DACT/
/Jefferey F Harold/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4112